



## **CADPAC Certification Subcommittee**

**Minutes  
August 17, 2007**

### **I. Welcome and Attendance**

Judge Gull opened the meeting at 9:30 am. The meeting was held at the Indiana Judicial Center, Room 1373.

**Members present:** Hon. Fran Gull, Hon. Bob Witham, Ms. Jodi Rittman, Mr. Bernie Burns, Ms. Cindy McCoy

**IJC Staff:** Lori Harmon

### **II. Minutes**

Minutes from the May 18, 2007 meeting were emailed prior to this meeting. The minutes were approved by consensus.

### **III. Rules Revisions**

Ms. Harmon announced that the revisions to the Rules passed without change by the Board of Directors, and provided the members with copies of the approved Rules and checklist for updating the rules.

### **IV. Placement Criteria Workgroup**

Ms. Rittman provided an update on the Placement Criteria Workgroup. The group has met but with members attending sporadically. The workgroup has reached a consensus that there is a need for standardized placement criteria. They still hope to have a first draft of the criteria by November, depending on attendance until then. The workgroup is meeting in the afternoon after each ICCADS meeting in the same room. Ms. Rittman indicated the workgroup is using the criteria from the behaviorally driven DSM and the medical model of the ASAM Placement Criteria and developing a continuum that takes both into consideration.

### **V. CSAMS Update**

1. The CSAMS written test was offered on June 27<sup>th</sup>. Eighteen candidates sat for the test with eleven passing and seven failing. Two persons have now failed twice and their next attempt will be their last. Those candidates applied to take the test before the rules revisions were approved,

so they will not be required to attend the additional training that is now required of all candidates failing the test twice, before they can take the test a third time.

2. Responses to the PNCO are due by the end of this month. So far we have had a few questions, but no submissions.
3. Mr. Burns indicated the CSAMS Test Revision Workgroup is looking at questions that have been missed by more than half of the candidates sitting for the test and questions that were missed by less than ten percent of the candidates. The determination mostly lies with whether the question is appropriately discerning. At this time it appears only a handful of questions need to be totally replaced with several others needing some revision. Judge Gull indicated that this process lends credibility to the test and the credential.
4. Ms. Harmon presented a request for an extension in the time limit for obtaining the CSAMS credential on behalf of Nat Bryan, Director of Jay County. A letter was distributed that Mr. Bryan sent to the committee requesting that Ms. Jinny Broderick be granted an extension to complete her Supervised Practical Training. Ms. Broderick's hire date was 4/11/06; however she was on maternity leave from 7/12/06 to 9/6/06. The program only receives approximately 100 referrals per year and currently there are two new staff members working toward the credential sharing those opportunities for supervision, especially on assessments. After considerable discussion, the subcommittee indicated the following response:
  - a. The committee has questions pertaining to the percentage of time Ms. Broderick has devoted to the program vs. other responsibilities for the contract agency, the feasibility of her going to a neighboring program to do some assessments, and the feasibility of having Ms. Broderick transferred to Access Services for a period of time to help achieve these hours.
  - b. The committee was impressed with Mr. Bryan's foresight in bringing this to the committee's attention early, and the committee would like to offer alternatives to help the program solve this dilemma that would not require an extension of the time period set forth in the Rules. The committee would like Ms. Harmon to work with Mr. Bryan to come up with a more definitive plan for completing the Supervising Practical Training.

## **VI. Certification Status Update**

Ms. Harmon provided an updated report on the current status program certifications. There was no significant discussion on this subject.

## **VII. New Business**

Ms. Harmon indicated that the committee had stated in an earlier meeting that they wanted to review the certification process after Ms. White had a chance to settle into her new position. Judge Gull asked the members to give Ms. Harmon verbal feedback on issues pertaining to the certification process. Ms. White was not able to provide comment at this time, but will be involved in future discussions on this subject. Comments are as follows:

1. Clarify the need for interviewing the Prosecuting Attorney and Defense Bar. The programs are faced with the question "what do you want me to say?" when making the interview appointments. Recommend that more time is spent in the file review process and with the treatment providers.
2. Sometimes there has been a problem with either the prosecutors or defense bar and the interview has given them an opportunity to voice their concerns and/or be educated by IJC on the program. There is a lot of scheduling and people to see, but IJC has been flexible in this process.
3. In drug court reviews the reviewers meeting with a focus group of clients—the drug courts identify the clients who will give honest answers.

4. Drug Court clients are more homogenous in their experiences and they are seen on a regular basis. Often the focus groups are done just before or after court, so the clients don't have to make a special trip to be included in the group.
5. Ms. Harmon indicated the focus groups are a great idea and have been discussed several times; however a logistical plan of how to implement them has been difficult to determine.
6. One suggestion would be to take whatever clients have appointments set that day; although some programs, especially small ones, do not set any appointments for the time of the review.
7. Another suggestion would be to have the programs implement a suggestion box and get feedback from all clients seen in the two weeks prior to the review. Mr. Burns and Ms. Rittman volunteered to pilot getting feedback from clients for a specific period of time prior to the review date.

#### **VIII. Adjournment and Future Meetings**

Judge Gull adjourned the meeting at 11:30am. The next subcommittee meeting is scheduled for **November 16, 2007** at the Indiana Judicial Center, Conference Room 1068 (13<sup>th</sup> floor) from 9:00am – 12:00pm. The meetings for 2008 are scheduled for February 15, May 16, August 22, and November 21, 2008. All 2008 meetings will be held at the new Indiana Judicial Center office at 30 South Meridian. Members are reminded that this will be a secured facility and check-in at the main door to the building will be required.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Lori Harmon*

Lori Harmon

CADP Assistant Administrator

October 11, 2007